Summa Summae S. Thomae Vol. 3 | Dissertation IV; Art I

Fr. Charles René Billuart, O.P.

Translated by 'ofsaintthomas' on 𝕏[1]

ON THE SUPREME PONTIFF | ARTICLE I

This question is a prelude to the question of the primacy of the Supreme Pontiff: For since the Roman Pontiff is the Successor of Saint Peter, whatever authority the latter had in the Church, the Roman Pontiff has it. Wherefore what I shall say for the primacy of Saint Peter proves the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

[1] Summa Summae Vol 3, pp. 118-124

I say: Peter alone was instituted by Christ, the visible head of the whole Church or rather the primacy was conferred by Christ on Peter alone, not only of honor and dignity, but of power and jurisdiction over the Apostles and the universal Church.

Proof 1: From a twofold place of Scripture. The first is Matthew 16 where Peter was confessing to Christ that he is the Son of God, immediately repaying the turn and reward of the confession, Christ says to him, "***Blessed art thou Simon bar-Jonah, because flesh and blood has not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven; and I say to thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, & the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: And to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; & whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loose in heaven.***" I infer, by which words, in their obvious sense accepted, is signified that the primacy of jurisdiction in the Church is conferred to Peter under a double metaphor, namely of foundation & of keys; for what is a foundation in a building, this is the head in a body, the Ruler in a City, the King of a Kingdom, the Master of a household in a home, & to whom the keys are handed over, he himself is instituted King or Governor of the City. Therefore, these words can apply to no other Apostle except Peter.

Proof of the Minor Premise: No one except Peter had confessed the divinity of Christ, no one except him could be called Simon Bar-Jonah, or Son of Jonah, no one except him was called Cephas which means Rock, Stone or Cliff. For Christ did not say, as the Latin version has it, You are Peter, but speaking in Syriac, You are Cephas, that is, you are Rock or Stone, & upon this

Rock or this Stone, where the pronoun this manifestly indicates the Rock of which mention was made before, as if he would say, You are the Rock upon which I will build my Church. Therefore You are Peter and not, You are Rock, because he followed the Greek text which has Petros, but in Greek both Petros and Petra signify a stone, & it seemed more appropriate to the Latin interpreter to attribute a masculine name such as Peter to a man than a feminine name like Petra: Therefore by these words the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church was granted to Peter alone. Thus also do almost all the Holy Fathers interpret this passage, especially Saint Augustine, whom the Sectarians oppose, namely in Psalm 69 and Sermon 29 on the Saints. Another passage of the Gospel is John 21, where Christ actually confers what he had promised Saint Peter in Matthew 16, cited because of his excellent confession of divinity after a threefold confession of singular love: "Simon, Son of Jonah, do you love me more than these? Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." It is established that these words as before, cannot apply to another man than Peter; for he is designated by his proper name and that of his Father, Jonah. Christ asks him a third time and the threefold confession would answer the threefold denial. When interrogating him excluding others he says: **“Do you love me more than these?”**, and Peter himself responded in his own name and not by the name of others: **“You know that I love you, Lord”**; for he could not with another person love you more. Secondly, it is evident that the universal Church is to be ruled by him committed: for he does not commit to these or those sheep or lambs, but indefinitely *my sheep, my lambs*. But all the faithful are sheep of Christ or lambs; by sheep are signified the people, by lambs pastors. Whence Bernard “Christ says, not to bishops or even apostles, so absolutely and indiscriminately so that all may be committed to be sheep? If you love me, Peter, feed *my* sheep. What? These or those? That is, the people of Christ or the reign?

My sheep; that Christ did not seem to designate some, but all? Nothing is excepted where distinction is absent."

And this place also they explain commonly by the most holy fathers, and by tradition confirmed conclusively, as indeed the Council of Chalcedon testifies, where in Acts it is said concerning St. Peter: *Who is Peter and rock of the Catholic Church and the rock of faith, the foundation.*[2] And this place also they explain commonly by the most holy fathers, and by tradition confirmed conclusively, as indeed the Council of Chalcedon testifies, where in Acts it is said concerning St. Peter: *Who is Peter and rock of the Catholic Church and the rock of faith, the foundation.* Christ in the Church instituted a monarchical government, in which one is the supreme prince, who possesses full authority of things. Reason also teaches it: for if it is necessary that all the apostles be the princes and rulers of the whole Church, yet one among them only is Peter, and this is seen from what precedes: therefore no other is assigned a judge of heretics. Therefore: The Church according to Daniel is compared to a kingdom, Canticle 6. The exercise of order, 1 Peter 3, Noah, John 10. All these things are governed by one supreme moderator. Therefore It follows that the best government of a multitude is that it be ruled by one. Therefore from this government, which is peace and unity of subordinates: and indeed one is more congruent a cause of unity and concord than many: for one is by itself cause of unity, but many only accidently, in so far as they are united in some way; for it is manifest that many cannot unite and agree unless some one agrees and unites them. Therefore, the objections are resolved.

[2] Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, De Consideratione, Bk 1 Chapter 8

Objection 1: From *Laudato* chapter 16, Matthew nothing can be proved for the primacy of St. Peter. Therefore because through these particulars: and above this Peter it is not understood Peter but Christ, as Augustine teaches in his *tractates on John*, saying: *Upon this rock which you have confessed, I will build my Church.*

Response: Augustine indeed hands down both expositions, and he himself acknowledges it; he says in book *1 Retractions chapter 21*: where he does not prefer one reading, but leaves it to the judge of the reader: of those two sentences, he says that whichever is more probable, the reader should choose, and he sings many times St. Ambrose; and since he is by far conformed to the text, as has been demonstrated, and since the holy fathers commonly hand it down, it ought to be preferred. If you ask why Augustine has given another exposition in a different place, and in many places? Many respond that he did this out of ignorance of the Hebrew or Syriac tongue. For in that place cited in the *Retractions*, the holy doctor adds, why these words: *And upon this rock*, are to be referred to Christ and not to Peter, he says, because they are not of the same kind; *You are Peter* and *on this rock I will build* — Peter was indeed Christ, exalted head: yet these things do not signify Peter, but something derived from the rock, as a stone and rock; hence in that place he translates *You are Peter*, and not *You are the rock*; and because the Church is founded upon Peter, it was not to be built on something solid or rocky. St. Augustine thought that something petrine (related to Peter) was to be built upon, but he understood that “rock” (petram) in that passage did not mean Peter himself, but Christ, about whom it was said, “The rock was Christ.” Therefore, if the holy Doctor had noticed that Cephas (Peter) signified nothing else than

rock or stone, and that Christ said, “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church,” he would undoubtedly have followed our interpretation everywhere without any doubt.

Objection 2: Christ, in Matthew 18, gave the same power to the other Apostles as to Peter, when he said to them: “Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven,” etc.

Response: Granted that the power of binding and loosing is equal in some way to the power of the keys (which Cajetan denies in chapters 5 and 7 of his work on the primacy of the Supreme Pontiff). Still, Christ granted equal power to the Apostles as to Peter in one way (N), and in the same way (not), and in a different way (C). For he granted it to the Apostles as delegates, but to Peter as ordinary and independent pastor; the Apostles received it dependently and subordinately to Peter, but to him independently and supremely. For it is clear from observation in Matthew 16 that it is said to Peter alone in the presence of the others: “I will give you the keys,” and in John 21: “Feed my sheep”; so if he received nothing special beyond the others in singular faith and love, why did he alone receive it?

Instance 1°: Christ in Matthew 28 and John 20 equally sends all the Apostles, and says to all equally: “As the living Father sent me, I also send you”; “Go therefore and teach all nations,” etc. Also in Acts 8, Peter was sent by the Apostles; but it is not the case that a superior is sent by inferiors.

Response. To the first: the Apostles followed from the mission of the Apostles in equality with Peter in the reason of apostleship, not in the reason of pastoral office, as has already been said, and will be explained more fully now. To the second: the Apostles sent Peter not by command, but by counsel; not by ordering, but by consulting and advising, just as chapters sometimes send their prelates, indeed as the king's counselors [send] the king for reasons for the gravity and urgency of the matters to be handled.

Instance 2°. St. Cyprian, in Book 2 On the Unity of the Church, says: "The other Apostles were certainly what Peter was [or: the rest of the Apostles were undoubtedly what Peter was], endowed with an equal partnership/share of honor [3]and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, and primacy is given to Peter, so that the Church may be shown to be one."

Response: S. Cyprian says that the other Apostles were equal to Peter in the partnership/share of honor and power in the reason/aspect of apostleship (C). In the reason/aspect of episcopate or pastoral office, no (N). Therefore, the other Apostles were equal to Peter as far as apostolic authority went, because they could preach to the Gentiles anywhere, administer the sacraments, impart the Holy Spirit, work miracles, write sacred books, found churches, make laws, and create bishops—but they did so as delegates and by extraordinary right, and as subordinated to St. Peter. Peter, however, exercised these powers as ordinary pastor, by his own ordinary right, not subordinated to the other Apostles; so that he himself was not bound by their laws (while they were bound by his), if he had established any laws for himself for the sake of defending the faith,

[3] Saint Cyprian, On the Unity of The Church Book 2

repressing heresy, or otherwise for the good of the Church against schism. In almost the same way as if the Pope were to send a legate to the East Indies with full power to do all things that seemed necessary or useful for those missions—the legate could do what the Pope can do, but by a different right: the legate by delegated and extraordinary right, the Pope by ordinary pastoral right and ordinary jurisdiction. These are the very words of the objection that indicate Cyprian's true meaning: but, he says, "*the beginning proceeds from unity, and primacy is given to Peter, so that the Church may be shown to be one.*" Therefore Peter has a primacy established for preserving the unity of the Church, which could not be preserved if there were no primacy of authority and power for settling dissensions, removing schisms, and eliminating other evils that could harm the Church's unity. Likewise, in the same Book 2 On the Unity of the Church, he openly declares these words of Christ: "*upon this rock I will build my Church*," referring personally to Peter, and "upon one Peter the Church was built." Therefore, Peter's power excels the power of the other Apostles in three ways:

1. What was in Peter as in an ordinary pastor, to be transmitted to his successors; but in the Apostles it was as in delegates, insofar as it was necessary for exercising apostleship throughout the whole world, and because of the great distances of places they could not easily approach Peter in emerging cases.

2. Peter's power extended over the other Apostles, but the power of the Apostles did not extend over Peter.

3. Peter could establish general laws for the whole Church, but the Apostles [could establish] only particular laws for the Churches which they were founding.

ON THE PRIMACY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF | ARTICLE II

Opinion I (Against the errors of the Greeks [Eastern Orthodox], etc.)

I say: The Roman Pontiff has primacy of authority in the universal Church. This is **de fide**.

Proof 1: From the preceding Article: The whole authority of Peter as Pastor and Ruler of the entire Church, which was supreme (as has been said), has been transmitted to his successors. But the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter. Therefore the major [premise] is clear; because when Christ founded the Church to endure perpetually, He ought to have established in it a perpetual form of government, which would not cease with the death of Peter, but would be transferred to his successors.

The minor premise is also clear: From the Fathers who drew up catalogs of the Roman Pontiffs (such as Optatus of Mileve [in his work against the Donatists], book 2 against Parmenian; Saint Augustine, Epistle to Generosus 165, etc.), they trace the origin of succession from St. Peter; and this is even more clearly proven from Councils and later Fathers who must still be cited. Hence, whatever proves the primacy of St. Peter also proves at the same time the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Proof 2: From Councils: The Council of Sardica (Serdica, 347), in its synodal letter to Pope Julius… "It will seem best and most fitting, if from each and every province the Lord's priests [bishops/clergy] refer [matters/appeals] to the head, that is, to the See of Peter the Apostle"

In the Council of Ephesus in the year 431, the Fathers say that the bishops, through the letter of Pope Celestine, pronounced a sentence against Nestorius. In the Council of Chalcedon in the year 451, Act 2. After the letter of St. Leo had been read, the most reverend bishops cried out: "This is the faith of the Fathers! This is the faith of the Apostles! We all believe thus! The orthodox believe thus!" Anathema to him who does not believe thus. Peter has spoken thus through Leo; the Apostles have taught thus.

In Act 16, the most glorious judges said: From the things which have been done, and from what each one has deposited, we have examined everything that has been done by each one, and we have examined everything according to the primacy and the principal honor preserved for the most beloved archbishop of ancient Rome, according to the canons. Finally, the Chalcedonian Fathers asked St. Pope Leo to confirm by his consent what they had decreed.

In the Sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople III in the year 680, the Fathers in the synodal letters to Pope Agatho (which exist after Act 18), among other things, address him thus: "We gladly receive your paternal letters of confession, sent from your paternal beatitude, which we recognize as divinely inspired from the supreme summit/vertex of the Apostles, through which we have recently expelled the manifold root of error. And below: We have clearly preached the splendid light of orthodox faith with you; we ask that you confirm it again through your honorable writings, we beseech your paternal sanctity."

The Council of Constance in the year 1414 condemns this opinion of Wycliff: "*That the Pope is the supreme Pontiff is ridiculous. And that Christ is not the head in Peter, nor in any other, is ridiculous. And Christ neither approved this dignity in Peter nor in another.*"

Likewise, this tenth article of John Hus: "*The Roman Pontiff is not the head of the Church.*" And this 27th: "There is not even a spark of appearance that there ought to be one head in spiritual things ruling the Church."

The Council of Florence in the year 1439, where in many discussions the question of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was ventilated between the Orientals [Easterners/Greeks] and Occidentals [Westerners], and finally, by the common consent of both parties, defined in the decree of Union: "We define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church, as is also contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons."

The Council of Trent, session 14, chapter 7: "*Deservedly*," it says, "*the supreme pontiffs, for the supreme power handed down to them in the universal Church, can reserve to themselves some more grievous causes of crimes, which they can refer to their own peculiar judgment.*"

Proof 3. From the Fathers. St. Irenaeus against heresies, book 3, chapter 3. Tertullian against Praxeas, chapter 3. St. Cyprian, Epistle 45 & Epistle 67. St. Dionysius of Alexandria, accused of heresy, purged himself before the Roman Pontiff, as Athanasius relates in book 1 On the Synods of Ariminum and Seleucia. Oriental councils were held to be invalid unless they were confirmed

by the authority of the Roman Pontiff, as Socrates Scholasticus testifies in book 2, chapter 5 of his Ecclesiastical History, and Sozomen in book 3, chapter 9. Pope Julius restored Athanasius, who had been deposed from his see, and summoned his enemies to the Apostolic Tribunal: as related by Athanasius in his Apology 2.

St. John Chrysostom, in Epistle 1 to Innocent I, himself begs that the sentence of deposition/excommunication passed against him by Theophilus of Alexandria be rescinded.

St. Jerome, Epistle 57 to Pope Damasus: "*To your beatitude," he says, "that is, to the Chair of Peter in communion I am joined: I know the Church built upon that very rock. Whoever eats the lamb outside this house is profane. If anyone was not in Noah's Ark, he perished while the flood reigned…. I do not know Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I ignore Paulinus: whoever does not gather with you scatters; that is, whoever is not of Christ is of the Antichrist.*"

St. Augustine, Epistle 157, 162, and book 1 to Boniface, chapter 1. St. Prosper in his poem On the Ungrateful [De Ingratis]. *"The see of Rome, Peter's see, which holds the pastoral honor, Has been made the head of the world; whatever it does not possess by arms, It holds by religion."*

St. Bernard, Book 2, Chapter 8 De Consideratione to Pope Eugene: "*You*," he says, "*are Peter in power, Christ in function; the other gatekeepers of heaven and pastors of the flocks are indeed also such; but you are so much more glorious inasmuch as you have a different and hereditary name above the others. They have assigned flocks, each one his own; to you the universal flock has been entrusted, one to one alone; not only the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves have*

you as the one Pastor…. And after he has proven this, as we do, from Matthew 16 and John 21, he concludes: Therefore let your privilege stand unshaken, both in the keys given to you and in the sheep commended to you."

The Gallican clergy in the assembly held in Paris in the year 1681 spoke thus about the Roman Pontiff: "*The Roman Pontiff is the head of the Church, the center of unity; he holds primacy of authority and jurisdiction, given by Christ Jesus in the person of Peter. Whoever dissents from this truth is a schismatic, indeed even a heretic.*" The same is taught by Gerson in On the Ecclesiastical Power, first consideration. From all these councils, holy Fathers, and ecclesiastical writers, we have that the Roman See is the Chair of Peter, the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiffs are the supreme judges in matters of faith, they resolve disputes, receive appeals from deposed bishops, restore to their sees those unjustly deposed, punish the censures of other churches (even in the East), or grant or refuse communion; they have approved or rejected councils, and finally have given laws to the other patriarchs and bishops. These are the most invincible arguments of jurisdictional primacy, which no one fails to see.

And from this I form the argument as follows:

Therefore, this has been and always has been from the beginning the constant faith of the Church: that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter, that he is the supreme pastor and head of the whole Church. But the Church cannot err in recognizing its supreme Pastor and Head; otherwise the gates of hell would have prevailed against it…

Objection 1. Canon 6 of the First Council of Nicaea has this: "*Let the ancient custom be preserved through Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, so that the Bishop of Alexandria may have power over all of them; because there is a similar custom for the Bishop of the city of Rome also. Likewise, however, both at Antioch and in the other provinces, etc.*" By these words it seems that the power of the Roman Pontiff is restricted to certain provinces, just as the power of the Alexandrian Bishop is.

Response: By these words the power of the Roman Pontiff is restricted, as he is the Roman Pontiff and successor of Peter, no (N). As he is Patriarch of the West, yes (C). To understand this, it must be observed that there are several prerogatives in the Roman Pontiff:

1. He is the ordinary Bishop of the city of Rome and its territory.
2. He is Metropolitan of the Roman Province.
3. He is Primate (or, as it was formerly called, Exarch), or major Metropolitan of the Provinces of Italy, to whom inferior Metropolitans are subordinated.
4. He is Patriarch of the West.
5. He is the head and supreme Pastor of the whole Church.

Therefore the comparison which the Nicene Council instituted between the Roman Bishop and the Alexandrian one is not that all the rights of the Roman Pontiff were equal, but that patriarchal rights only — of which the principal one was the right of ordination, especially of Metropolitans

throughout the whole Patriarchate. This Canon was occasioned by Meletius; for when he violated the ancient custom. Meletius, having caused a schism, had disturbed the custom according to which the Bishop of Alexandria would celebrate sacred ordinations in the dioceses of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, or would grant permission for them to be celebrated. The Council of Nicaea, by issuing the sixth canon, wished to assert and confirm the privileges of the Bishop of Alexandria and of the others.

Instance 1°. The patriarchal dignity is posterior to the Nicene Council, and in that canon there is no mention of patriarchs, but only of metropolitans; therefore the comparison between the Roman Bishop and the Alexandrian one is not about patriarchal rights.

Response 1°: The patriarchal dignity is posterior to Nicaea as regards the name, yes (C); as regards the thing/reality itself, no (N). For before the Council, the Bishop of Alexandria already enjoyed patriarchal rights, in which Meletius of Lycopolis had disturbed him — who attempted to make ordinations in those provinces. However, in the canon the name “Metropolitan” is used, because at that time it was common not only to ordinary metropolitans, but also to primates and patriarchs.

Objection 2. From the denial to the Roman Pontiff of the right of appeals from the whole world: If the Roman Pontiff had primacy of jurisdiction in the universal Church, it would be possible to appeal to him from the whole Christian world; but the minor premise is false. Therefore the antecedent [conclusion] is false.

Proof of the Minor. Therefore, From the African Council: The Council of Mileve in Africa, Canon 22, prohibits transmarine [overseas] appeals, or to the Roman See, with these words: “If anyone appeals across the sea, or to the Roman See, let him not be received into communion by anyone in Africa unless he has first appealed to African councils, or to the primates of his own provinces. But for those who think they should appeal overseas, let no one in communion in Africa receive them.”

Instance 2°. The African bishops, among whom Augustine lived, in the Sixth Council of Carthage in the year 418, did not want to admit appeals to Pope Zosimus which his legates themselves were contending to vindicate, alleging the canons of the Nicene Council.

Response 2°: The minor, as is clear from the proofs and conclusions, to which add Canons 3, 4, 5, & 7 of the Council of Sardica in the year 347, among which the fourth has this: “If any bishop has been deposed by the judgment of the bishops who are in the neighborhood, and says that the matter of his defense should compete for him again; he shall not be deposed before, so that another be substituted in the chair [of a deposed bishop] until the Roman Pontiff, having heard the case, pronounces a sentence.

Moreover, it must be observed that although the right of appeals is annexed to the primacy of the Apostolic See, nevertheless the Roman Pontiffs have not always, nor toward all, exercised it; but they have introduced and observed it according to custom in many provinces, with the consent of

the simpler priests and lower clergy, so that cases — whether from bishops or provincial councils, or from primates, or ultimately defined by primates — might not give occasion for clerics to wander about, or lest by too frequent appeals the authority of bishops might be weakened, and those who had first judged might be unjustly harassed, and cases that were otherwise easy might be dragged out for a long time. With these premises…

Response to the First Proof: The Council of Mileve does not prohibit all appeals, but only those of presbyters, deacons, and lower clergy. And this according to received custom, accepted with the consent of the Supreme Pontiff for the reasons given in the above observation.

Response to the Second Proof: The African Church did not reject the right but the custom of appeals to the Roman See, which had been accepted for some time due to error; but later, after the deposition [of Apiarius?], it recognized and venerated it. The explanation is: When Apiarius of Sicca, an African presbyter, appealed to the Roman See; and the African bishops were greatly displeased that Zosimus, Pope, had given communion to him in his legates' commonitory to the Carthaginian Council, he founded his custom of appeals on the Nicene canons — which were not Nicene, but Sardican: yet the custom was to cite at the Apostolic See the Sardican canons under the name of Nicene; because the Council of Sardica was always held as an appendix to the Nicene Council, since in the Sardican [council] there was nothing concerning faith …nothing concerning the faith was defined [at Sardica], but only the Nicene faith was confirmed and its defenders vindicated. Not paying attention to this, the Africans searched everywhere for the canons of the Nicene Council — both in the code which they had with them, and in the codes

preserved at Constantinople and Alexandria — and when they did not find in them the canons cited by Zosimus, they concluded that the custom of appeals to the Roman See was founded on supposititious [forged or falsely attributed] canons, and therefore they impugned it. However, they did not define anything to the contrary, but rather asked Boniface and Celestine, successors of Zosimus (for he had died after the departure of his legates), with various reasons adduced, that from then on they should not receive appeals from Africans. Truly, these things profited nothing, because Pope Celestine himself received the repeated appeal of the same Apiarius, and the African bishops themselves were liberated from their error; and even the African bishops, freed from error, brought the appeal of Antonius, Bishop of Fussala, to the holy See, as is clear from Augustine himself — who was then the principal among the Africans — in Epistle 209 (formerly 261), to the same Celestine.

Objection 3°. The authority of bishops is immediately from God, just as the authority of the Pope is, according to Acts 20: "*The Holy Spirit has placed bishops to rule the Church of God.*" And St. Jerome says in his Epistle to Evagrius: "*If authority is sought, the greater orb is the city. What does the custom of one city profit me? Wherever there has been a bishop — whether in Rome, or Constantinople, or Reggio, or Alexandria, or Tanis — he has the same merit and the same priesthood.*" Therefore…

Response to the First Objection with Sylvio, book 4, Controversies, article 5; Soto, Bellarmine, etc.

The authority of bishops is immediately from God if it is understood as the power of order, yes (O). For just as Christ principally baptizes, so He principally consecrates and confers the character. If it is understood as the power of jurisdiction, no (N). For bishops have this power of jurisdiction from God mediately through the Supreme Pontiff: because since the government of the Church is monarchical, all jurisdiction resides in one head as in the source from which it is derived to others, as St. Leo says in Epistle 89: "*The sacrament of this office,*" he says, "*the Lord willed to pertain to all the blessed Apostles in such a way that He placed it principally in the most blessed Peter, the head of all the Apostles, so that from him as from a kind of head He willed to bestow His gifts upon the whole body.*" Hence bishops, whether nominated or elected, have no jurisdiction unless they are confirmed by the Roman Pontiff. And thus the author in 4, d. 20, a. 4, contra Gent., c. 76, where he says that Christ promised to Peter alone: "*To you I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,*" so that it might be shown that the power of the keys was to be derived through him to others. Some others, such as Natalis Alexander, sect. 1, Diss. 4; Gersonius De Statibus Ecclesiasticis, consid. 3, seem to recognize that the jurisdiction of bishops is also immediately from God, but that its exercise depends on the Supreme Pontiff — which does not differ much. Nor does it stand in the way of what is said in Acts 20: "*Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops,*" etc. For we do not deny that the Holy Spirit institutes bishops, but mediately through the supreme head of the Church, just as He instituted those whom the Apostle addressed through the ministry of the Apostles.

Response To the Second Part: St. Jerome does not speak there about the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, but about the authority of the custom of the city of Rome, which he says is lesser than the authority of the custom of the whole Church: for he argues against the custom introduced by a few in the diocese of Rome, who, since there were few, and they were treasurers of the ecclesiastical treasury, set themselves as prelates over presbyters contrary to the right and ancient custom of the whole orb. What he adds — that bishops everywhere are of the same merit — must be understood about the character of order, the power of order; compare the text of Saint Jerome in the proofs.

ON THE INFALLIBILITY OR INERRANCY OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF IN DEFINING QUESTIONS OF FAITH OR MORALS | ARTICLE III

§ 1

(Things to be Noted in Advance - Praenotada)

Note 1°. A man who is the Pope can be considered in two ways: by reason of the suppositum [the individual person] and by reason of the office; or as a private man and as the supreme Vicar of Christ. And in both ways he can be considered as speaking: He speaks as a private man when from his own mind, not from the plenitude of power, he interprets a book, expresses a private opinion, treats and resolves a question.

But he speaks as Pontiff, as supreme Pastor of the Church and head, when as supreme Pastor of the whole Church and head he proposes something to the whole Church in matters of faith and morals, obliging all the faithful under pain of heresy to believe it with divine faith.

And thus it is said to speak **ex cathedra** [from the chair], that is, from the plenitude of power, because through the "cathedra" [chair/throne] is signified the authority of teaching and commanding. Hence that in Matthew 23: "*The scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of Moses,*" etc.

Some say this distinction is a recent invention, but it is presupposed from the nature of the thing itself, and in all public offices some such distinction is found — for a king, praetor, or judge does not always act ex officio as king, praetor, or judge. The Gallican nation in the year 1305 used this distinction in the libel given to Clement V against Boniface VIII, as we shall see below. The present question, therefore, is not about the supreme Pontiff as a private man, whom the more common opinion holds can err as such, but about the Pontiff as Pontiff speaking ex cathedra.

Regarding this there are two opinions:

The First Opinion is that of the French [Gallicans], who for the most part hold that the supreme Pontiff is not infallible in matters of faith and morals, unless with the antecedent consent of the Church, whether in a general council gathered together, or at least through the consent of the Church diffused throughout the world, as declared in the declaration of the Gallican Clergy of

1682. Its fourth article has this: "*In questions of faith also, the supreme Pontiff has his part, and his decrees pertain to all and individual churches, and yet his judgment is not irreformable unless the consent of the Church has acceded to it.*"

The Other Opinion is that of all the other nations which constantly hold that the supreme Pontiff, speaking ex cathedra in the manner we have explained, independently of the consent of the Church (whether gathered in council or diffused), is infallible in deciding questions of faith and morals.

Although, however, we openly show this common opinion to be founded in the Scriptures and Tradition, as will appear, yet we propose it not as something to be believed with obligating faith, nor do we assert it as such; because the Church, whose it is, according to all, has certainly proposed revealed truths, but has not yet defined them specially and by express solemn decree, nor is certainty of respective revelation sufficient to oblige to faith.

Note 2°. In definitions two things must be distinguished: the intended definition or conclusion, and the reasons/conclusions or things said obiter [by the way] and occasionally. Of the intended definition or conclusion alone is the common opinion to be understood, not of the reasons of the definition, or of those things said passively and on the occasion.

§. II.

The common opinion is asserted and proved by the clearest testimonies of Scripture.

I say: The judgment of the Roman Pontiff speaking ex cathedra in matters of faith and morals is infallible independently of the consent of the Church.

Proof. From a threefold passage of Scripture.

The first is Matthew 16, where Peter's confession of Christ's divinity, Christ says: "*Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to you that you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,*" etc. These words are directed to Peter alone, as we proved in Article I, where we discussed the primacy of St. Peter. Likewise, they pertain to Peter's successors in the Roman See, as we showed in Article 3, where we treated the primacy of the Roman Pontiff; for since Christ founded the Church to endure forever, the foundation of it ought to remain forever in Peter's successors. Nor is there any difficulty in this way: these words even our adversaries concede, who from this passage and the following ones prove with us against the sectarians the primacy of St. Peter and of the Roman Pontiff.

Subsumption: Therefore, by these words the privilege of infallibility is promised to Peter and his successors.

Proof of the Subsumption: Therefore, by these words the infallibility of the Church is promised: But the Church or building cannot be indefectible if the foundation on which it rests is defectible. The second passage is Luke 22, where Christ, in the hour of His Passion, thus

addresses Peter: "*Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for you, that your faith fail not: and you, being once converted, confirm your brethren.*"

1. Christ by these words promises to Peter indefectibility in faith; for He prays for this, and there is no doubt that He was heard for His reverence.

2. These words are directed to Peter alone, not to the other Apostles, nor in them to the whole Church: For He makes an open distinction of Peter from the other Apostles, and says to the whole Church: "And you, being once converted, confirm your brethren"; and when He immediately before said in the plural: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you [plural: vos]," He at once subjoins in the singular: "But I have prayed for you [singular: te]," etc. — which He would not have done if He had addressed all the Apostles, and in them the Church; but He would have said: "I have prayed for you [plural: vobis], that your [plural: vestra] faith fail not, and you [plural: vos], being once converted," etc. Indeed, neither "your faith" [singular: fides vestra], nor "you being converted" [vos conversi]… He could not have said that, since the Church consists of the faithful, and besides them there are no others in the Church who are "brethren" needing to be confirmed.

3. What is principal: He promises indefectibility to Peter not as a private person, but as Pastor of the Church — the very office which He was about to institute according to the promise

made in Matthew 16. Consequently, this pertains to his successors: For He promises indefectibility to him, so that he may confirm his brethren in faith — which pertains to the office of Pastor and head.

Hence this copulative proposition: “I have prayed for you, that your faith fail not: and you, being once converted, confirm your brethren” has the force of a causal or rational connection, as if He were saying: “Therefore I have prayed that your faith fail not, so that you may confirm your brethren”; or: “I have prayed that your faith not fail, so that you, endowed with indefectible faith, may confirm your brethren.”

Therefore the holy Fathers who inferred from this passage the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff testify to this:

- St. Leo, Sermon 3 on these words of Luke.
- St. Agatho, Epistle to the Emperor Constantine, which was read and approved in the Sixth Synod.
- Leo IX, Epistle to Michael, Patriarch of Constantinople.
- St. Bernard, Epistle 190.
- Innocent II, Innocent III, Epistle 209 to the Patriarch of Constantinople.
- St. Thomas, Summa Theologiae II-II, Q. 1, Art. 10.

Adversaries respond that the indefectibility promised to Peter is transmitted to his successors, but not in this sense — that each one is indefectible in faith — but in this sense: that the faith will never fail in the future, that is, that the series of Peter’s successors, and the succession over

which they preside, and the Church which they undertake to teach and govern, will not fail in faith. Hence nothing will harm this faith if some Pontiffs fail in office and deviate from the faith: for the Roman faith remains unshaken from their predecessors, to be vindicated by their successors. But on the contrary:

1. The holy Fathers most recently praised, who from these words prove indefectibility not only of the Roman See or of the Church, but of each individual Roman Pontiff.

2. According to this interpretation, the promise of indefectibility is made not to Peter alone, but to the Church is made this promise, whose contrary is clear from the explanation.

3. Christ prayed not only that the faith should not simply and absolutely fail, but that it should not fail in Peter: Therefore neither in any of his successors.

4. If one of Peter's successors should fail in faith while teaching, he could not confirm his brethren — which would never happen, since Christ prayed for it.

5. If a single Pontiff speaking ex cathedra could err and err in faith, how could the See remain inviolate? How could faith subsist in it? For the See must hear the one sitting [in judgment] and obey him. They say: It was so in his predecessors, it will be so in his successors. Granted — but now it is not so.

Therefore, They insist that the very word "confirm" does not indicate supreme and unchangeable judgment: For "confirm" means this — as far as it is in you, make firm entirely: "*We sent Timothy,*" says the Apostle in 1 Thessalonians 3, "*to confirm you*"; and to each bishop it is said in the Apocalypse 3: "*Be watchful and confirm the rest who are about to die.*"

Response: We do not prove from this single word "confirm" alone, but from the entire period: "*I have prayed for you… and you, confirm*," etc., that the judgment of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, unchangeable, and infallible; because by these words Christ promises to Peter — and to each of his successors — indefectibility in faith, so that he may confirm the faithful, and thus constitutes him the supreme and infallible Judge in matters of faith — which cannot be said of Timothy, or of any other bishop. The third passage is John 21, where Christ commits to Peter alone, above the other Apostles, the care of the whole Church: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." See Article 1 on the primacy of St. Peter; the fuller exposition of this passage is there applied to our matter. Therefore Peter — and each of his successors — must feed the universal Church by the word of doctrine; the Church must hear him and follow his doctrine; but the Church cannot follow a false doctrine; for it is indefectible. Therefore neither Peter nor any of his successors can propose a false doctrine to the Church; and…

…it would be absurd for an infallible flock to be presided over by a fallible Pastor; then indeed the flock would rather pasture the Pastor than the Pastor pasture and govern the flock.

They respond from these words: "Feed my sheep" indicates only the office of Peter, not that the precept of office is fulfilled — otherwise it would follow that Peter and his successor not only never erred in doctrine, but never sinned in any part of the pastoral office, since there is certainly no part of the office which that word does not encompass.

Response: No (N). Absurd indeed — for an infallible flock to be presided over by a fallible Pastor.

To The Proof.

1. From these words we infer the right of infallibility of the Pontiff in proposing the faith to the Church; for he is indefectible in faith, because the Church is indefectible in the faith of its subjects, whose indefectibility would be broken if the Pastor proposed a false doctrine which they must follow. But it is not so that the Church is indefectible in the morals of its members. Hence it is not necessary that the Pastor be impeccable in other parts of the pastoral office, as he is in proposing the faith.

2. As long as faith remains, the bond of the Church subsists, and its root, by which it remains permanent; other virtues can revive. But if faith is subverted, the body of the Church does not subsist, and almost every hope of salvation is taken away. Hence the spiritual Pastor must above all and above everything take care that faith is preserved incorrupt in the flock. And from this you have why the other bishops, who are also pastors, do not enjoy the privilege of infallibility; for since they preside not over the universal flock privately, their error would not infect the universal Church, but only their own flock; and besides, since they have a supreme infallible Pastor, and are subordinated to him, their error can be corrected by the infallible supreme Pastor himself.

Confirm the conclusion with an argumentum ad hominem: The Gallican theologians from these cited passages of Scripture prove with us against the heretics the primacy of the Roman Pontiff over the universal Church. Why therefore do they not also admit from the same passages

the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in proposing the faith? Since they prove no more from these passages the primacy than the infallibility?

§. III.

The Conclusion is Proved from the Fathers (**Probatur Conclusio ex Patribus**).

Besides the holy Fathers already praised in the preceding §, the following are to be read:

- St. Irenaeus, book 1, chapter 2, against heresies, chapter 3.
- St. Hippolytus the Martyr, Oration on the consummation of the world.
- St. Basil, Epistle 74.
- St. Flavian, Epistle to St. Leo.
- St. Cyprian, book 1 On the Unity of the Church & Epistle 55.
- St. Ambrose on Psalm 40.
- "Where Peter is, there is the Church," he says.
- St. Jerome, Epistle 57 to Pope Damasus: "*Whoever does not gather with you scatters.*" And in his edition of the creed/symbol addressed to the same.

Saint Augustine, after the Pelagian heresy had been condemned by Innocent I, in Sermon 2 (now 131) on the words of the Apostle chapter 10, says: "*Already on this account two councils were sent to the Apostolic See: from there letters also came; the cause is finished.*" Would that someday the error might be finished. And in the Psalm, against the Donatist party on the Roman Pontiff: "*You are the rock,*" he says, "*which the proud gates of hell do not overcome.*"

St. Thomas asks in this part (II-II, Q. 1, Art. 10): **Whether it pertains to the Supreme Pontiff to order the issuing of a symbol/creed of faith?** And he responds thus: "*It must be said that a new edition of the symbol is necessary to avoid errors that are arising. Therefore it pertains to his authority to issue the symbol, to whose authority it pertains finally to determine those things that belong to faith, so that all may hold them with unshaken faith. But this pertains to the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, to whom the more important and difficult questions of faith are referred to the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, to whom the greater and more difficult questions of the Church are referred, as is said in the Decretals, extra de Baptismo, c. Maiores. Hence also the Lord in Luke 22 said to Peter, whom He constituted the Supreme Pontiff: "I have prayed for you, Peter, that your faith fail not, and you, being once converted, confirm your brethren." And the reason for this is: because there must be one faith for the whole Church, according to that in 1 Corinthians 1: "That you all say the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you." This could not be preserved unless questions of faith that arise are determined by him who presides over the whole Church, so that his judgment is firmly held by the entire Church. And therefore it pertains to the supreme authority of the Supreme Pontiff to issue a new edition of the Symbol [creed], just as it pertains to all other things that concern the whole Church, such as to convoke a general synod and things of this kind. Ibid., to the second [objection]: "It pertains," he says, "to the Supreme Pontiff to order a new Symbol of faith, whose authority convokes the synod and whose judgment is confirmed."*

Ibid, question 11, article 2, reply to 3: The universal Church's authority principally resides in the Supreme Pontiff. For it is said in 24, question 1: "*Whenever the matter of faith is discussed, I think that all our brothers and fellow bishops, not except Peter, that is, those who bear the name of his authority, ought to be referred to Peter, against whose authority neither Jerome, nor Augustine, nor any of the sacred Doctors defends his own opinion.*" Hence Jerome says to Pope Damasus: "*This is the faith, most blessed Pope, which we have learned in the Catholic Church: Although we have always held it, in which if anything has been less skillfully or a little carelessly placed by us, we desire to be corrected by you who hold the faith and see of Peter.*" These things are plain and open, and we do not express our opinion in clearer terms. Nevertheless.

The defenders of papal infallibility after Gerson and St. Thomas concede that the Pontiff has supreme and full ecclesiastical power respectively to individual faithful and particular Churches, but not respectively to the whole Church. But on the contrary.

The present question is not about the ecclesiastical power of the Pontiff in the universal Church, of which in the following article. Nevertheless, it is openly expressed here by St. Thomas that it is supreme and full respectively to the whole Church that the authority principally resides in the Supreme Pontiff. He says: "*It pertains to the sole authority of the Supreme Pontiff to issue a Symbol of faith, and finally to determine those things that belong to faith, so that they may be held by all with unshaken faith.*" But, they say, by "*sole*" The angelic doctor understands it as "*principal*."

Response: No one ever interpreted "sole" as "principal" by faith; if it is principal, it is not sole; if it is sole, it is not principal. When I say: "It pertains to the sole authority of the King to make laws for the whole kingdom," who would imagine me to understand "sole" as "principal"? Nor does it help that St. Thomas in the argument says "on the contrary" that the Symbol is issued by the authority of the universal Church — for all know that at D. Thomas this is a light argument from the contrary, but not from the argument itself. Nevertheless, we do not deny that the Symbol is issued by the authority of the Church; but according to St. Doctor, the authority is attributed to the Supreme Pontiff, who presides over the whole Church, and to whose sole authority it pertains to issue the Symbol, to convoke and confirm general synods, and to manage all things that pertain to the whole Church.

But why do we delay in refuting this violent interpretation, when we have St. Thomas himself expressly excludes it: "*Just as a later synod,*" he says in Q. 10 de pot. A. 4 Ad. 13, "*has the power of interpreting the Symbol established by a prior synod, and of adding something to its explanation; so also the Roman Pontiff has this faculty*"… in a general council, it pertains to the supreme Pontiff's authority to order the issuing of a Symbol of faith, and finally to determine those things that belong to faith, so that they may be held by all with unshaken faith.

These things have been most clearly supported by the most perspicacious Theologians: Hence they conclude that if St. Thomas had conceded to the supreme Pontiff an absolute and independent infallibility from the consent of the Church, it would be licit for them in the doctrine of the Fathers who preceded him, and Did then St. Thomas become blind in the doctrine of the Fathers, he whose greatest praise is that he was the mouth of the Holy Fathers, and infused all into himself as if in one? St. Thomas, I say, concerning whom the most celebrated Academy of

Paris in a Decree published under Stephen the Bishop of Paris thus sings: "Blessed Thomas was the most brilliant light of the universal Church, a radiant gem of clerics, the fountain of Doctors, the most clear mirror of our University, and a notable and shining candelabrum, through which all who enter the ways of life and the schools of sound doctrine see the light." I do not press further. Concerning the Council of Constance I shall speak in the following article.

§. IV. | It is proven from the Councils and Popes

From the Council of Sardica see the preceding article. From the Council of Ephesus, in the same second proof, we saw that the Fathers, through the letter of Pope Celestine, pronounced a sentence against Nestorius. From the Council of Chalcedon we also said in the same article that in Act 2, after the celebrated letter of St. Leo to St. Flavian had been read, the Fathers exclaimed: "*This is the faith of the Fathers… Peter has spoken through Leo*." Likewise, after the council was finished, the Fathers asked St. Leo to confirm what had been decreed in the council as sanctioned: He confirmed, however, only those things which pertained to the Eutychian heresy. Our adversaries object, and strongly urge the examination of the celebrated Epistle of Saint Leo to Flavian made by the Synod, from which they infer that the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff in causes of faith is not unretractable. Response: That that examination was made, not because the Synod suspected any error in that Epistle; for already before, which must be well noted, they had subscribed to it without examination, and often the Fathers had exclaimed, "*As Leo, so we believe, Peter has spoken through Leo, we have all subscribed to the Epistle, what has been set forth suffices for faith, another exposition is not permitted to be made.*" That examination was

made therefore after the Epistle had already been received, so that the Eutychians who execrated it as Nestorian might be more convinced, and that there might be no further reason for them to retract it, which might be confirmed by the consent of the whole Church, as Saint Leo himself says in Epistle 65 to Theodoret, and the Synodal Fathers in the relation to the Emperor Marcian, "To those who believe," they say, speaking of that Epistle, "an undisputed perception suffices for the utility of the faith, drawing devout minds to the confession of the pious dogma: But it is necessary to meet those who attempt to pervert the right doctrine in every single thing that they bring forth wrongly." Whence when the Fathers of the V Synod in Collation 6, so that they might prepare a way for themselves for the condemnation of the Epistle of Ibas, which had not been discussed nor approved in the Council of Chalcedon, said that the Epistle of Saint Leo had not been received in the same Council, without inquiry and collation with the Doctrine of the Fathers, they either erred in fact, as is clear from the acts of the Council of Chalcedon. or they understand it concerning the second reception, which was only a more ample declaration of the first for the greater and more effective refutation of the Eutychians.

Pope Agatho on the occasion of the VI General Council of Constantinople III, in the year 680, wrote two letters to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, the first alone, the second with the Roman Council; in the second he securely pronounces that he had commanded his Legates to the Council, that what he himself had defined with his Council should not be examined as doubtful and uncertain, but should be published as certain and immutable. And against those who contradicted, he brings forth a sentence of condemnation: This letter, however, was read in act 4 and approved and subscribed by all in act 8, with no one contradicting, except one Macarius the

Monothelite, who for that reason was deposed by the council. In the first letter, Agatho says that the Roman Church and Roman Pontiffs have never failed in faith or will fail, but that it is their part to confirm the brethren in faith, and that their predecessors have always done this. This letter, like the preceding one, the Fathers likewise received, Act 18, each one individually assenting in his order. And in an acclamatory sermon they said: **PETER SPOKE THROUGH AGATHO**. And in the letter to Agatho himself: To you, as the primate of the universal Church, we leave what should be done, standing upon the firm rock of faith. Someone replies that Agatho's letters were not received without a prior examination, from which he infers they were not held by the Council as infallible.

Response 1: That only one or another of the Fathers made mention of an examination, all the rest simply voted without any mention of an examination.

Response 2: the Antecedent being granted, I deny the Illation: For not everyone who examines a doctrine doubts its truth: Thus, theologians daily examine the sacred Scriptures, the Decrees of Ecumenical Councils, by conferring them with Scripture and Tradition, not because they doubt in any way the truth of the Scriptures or the decrees of faith, but that they may be more and more confirmed in them, and may be ready to answer all who inquire about them, and more suitable to convince the refractory. Thus the Ephesine Fathers examined the Letter of St. Leo, in no way doubting its truth, as we said above. Likewise, if the Synod approved the Letters of Agatho after an examination was made: Therefore, by the examination made, it approved the infallibility of

the Roman Pontiff clearly asserted in them. General Council of Constantinople IV, in the year 869, against Photius, no one was admitted unless he had first subscribed to the formula of faith sent by Adrian II: In this formula of faith, however, the following are contained: "*Because the Sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ, who says: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, cannot be omitted. These things which have been said are proven by the outcome of events, because in the Apostolic See Religion has always been preserved immaculate, and holy Doctrine celebrated. Therefore, desiring least of all to be separated from this faith and Doctrine, and following in all things the constitutions of the Fathers and especially the holy Prelates of the Apostolic See, we anathematize all heresies together with the iconoclasts.*" Behold, in a general Council the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is admitted, founded on the words of Christ, *Thou art Peter*, etc. In the Council of Vienne, Clement V in the Clementine "De summa Trinit." §. "Nos igitur," defines that it belongs **TO THE APOSTOLIC CONSIDERATION ALONE** to declare what is obscure in the Scriptures. Pope Clement VI, himself a Gaul and Doctor of Paris, proposed fourteen articles of Doctrine to the Armenians recently converted to the Catholic Faith, which they should subscribe to [if they wished to join] the Roman Church. The fifth of these was as follows: "*If you have believed and still believe that in such a degree has been, so also will be the supreme and preeminent authority and juridical power of the Roman Pontiffs, and of those who will be in the future; so that they could not, we could not, nor will they be able in the future to be judged by anyone, but reserved to God alone to be judged, we may be reserved and they will be reserved.*" And that from our Sentences and judgments it could not, nor can, nor will it be possible to appeal to any other Judge? The thirteenth had thus: "*If you have believed and still believe that the Roman Pontiff alone in doubts emerging concerning the Catholic Faith, can, can*

by authentic determination, to which one must inviolably adhere, impose an end: And that whatever he determines to be true by the authority of the keys delivered to him by Christ, is true and Catholic, and that which he determines to be false and heretical, such it should be considered?" These things are found in Odoricus Raynaldus in the Annals for the year 1346 and 1351.

Our adversaries say: The Supreme Pontiffs whom we have praised up to this point spoke in their own cause. Therefore their testimonies prove nothing.

Response 1°. The Supreme Pontiffs spoke in their own cause openly and with no one contradicting, yes (C). Ant. With others contradicting, no (N). And consequently. Thus, while in the whole past antiquity, bishops of their see, kings and princes of their thrones defended the rights of their thrones by public acts which no one contradicted, their testimonies were admitted, and why should those of the Pontiffs not be admitted, who by monuments and public acts, which no one in their time contradicted, testified to and defended the privileges of their see?

Response 2°. The Pontiffs praised were not only distinguished by erudition, but by provenness of life; and many among them are numbered among the saints. Therefore there is no reason to suspect that from pride and ambition they wanted to claim unfounded and unjust privileges for themselves.

§ V. | It is proved from the Gallican Fathers, Bishops and Theologians

1°. The Fathers of the Council of Arles in the year 455, in the synodal letter to the Pope Leo, say: the apostolic writing (undoubtedly most celebrated Epistle to St. Flavian) in such a way that the Symbol of faith, whoever does not neglect the sacraments of religion, he inscribes on the tablets of the heart, and holds tenaciously to confound the errors of heretics, so that it may be more ready and commended to memory.

2°. In the year 517, St. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, in the name of the Gallican Church, acknowledges the Supreme Pontiff as the supreme judge in causes of faith: Thus he writes in his Epistle to Pope Hormisdas:

"*We therefore ask, joined to my service, that whatever our sons, our brothers — that is, the Gallicans — if they consult, we should be able to respond with instruction. Because now secure, I do not say of Vienne, but of the devotion of all Gaul, I promise, that all our devotion, above the state of faith, to capture the sentence. Pray that thus our preaching may not fall into falsehood, as from the unity which you guard, truth may not be separated by falsehood.*" Likewise, the Council of Tours in the year 567, to which almost the entire Gallican Church had come together.

3°. In the year 1324, Stephen, Bishop of Paris, on the occasion of the Bull of Canonization of St. Thomas Aquinas, issued by the same Academy of Doctors, with the consent of the Dean and Chapter of Paris and the Masters of the said University, edited a Decree of the following tenor: "*We therefore attending, as the sacred Roman Church, Mother and Teacher of all, is founded in*

the most firm confession of Peter, Christ's Vicar, to which, as to the universal rule of Catholic truth, pertains the approbation and reprobation of doctrines, declaration of doubts, determination of things to be held, and confutation of errors," etc. A few years later the same Academy presented to Clement VII (residing in Avignon, whom Gaul recognized as the true Pontiff) a Theological Tract in which it asserted and proved the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in questions of faith, using the same authorities from Scripture and the Fathers by which we have proved it.

4°. The same opinion was held by the whole Gallican Nation in the year 1305, when the Proceres of the Kingdom, in the name of the Nation, petitioned Clement V (residing in Avignon, whom Gaul recognized as the true Pontiff) with a libel to condemn the memory of Boniface VIII; they said:

"*It is not inquired about a heretical Pope as such, that is, as Pope, but as a private person. For neither was a Pope able to be a heretic as Pope, but as a private person. Nor was there ever any Pope, while Pope, who was a heretic.*"

By this testimony not only is the conclusion proved from the mind of the Nation, but also this distinction between the Pope as Pope and as a private man is held, not as a recent invention, as some claim. In the year 1579, the Gallican Clergy in the general Estates of Melun against the errors of Luther and Calvin prescribed thus: "*Clerics and Laics openly profess that same faith which the holy Roman Church, Teacher, proclaims and holds, as the column and firmament of truth. For this reason, because of its own principalitas [primacy/principal standing], it is*

necessary that all the Church be convened to it." And at the end of the articles it is subjoined: "*All these things we subject to the judgment and authority of the holy Roman Church, by whose precepts the faithful people are instructed, and by which a certain rule of correction of faith and morals is established.*"

5°. In the year 1626, the general Estates of the Gallican Clergy, in article 1637, resolved: "*...exhorting bishops to observe the Apostolic See, and the Roman Church founded on the infallible promise of God… Peter with the keys given infallibility of faith, which we see by divine power's miracle, in Peter's successors to this day, remains immovable.*"

6°. In the year 1655, eighty-five bishops gathered in the Estates, petitioned Pope Innocent X for judgment on the book of Jansenius, with this most important reason: "*...that major causes are to be referred to the Apostolic See — this is the solemn custom of the Church, in which the faith of Peter never fails perpetually to be preserved.*"

And in the year 1658, giving thanks to the same Pontiff for the condemnation of the book of Jansenius, in letters sent they say: "*We have clearly understood, not only from Christ's promise made to Peter, but also from the acts of prior Pontiffs, that judgments for establishing the rule of faith are given to the Supreme Pontiffs over the consultation of bishops throughout the universal*

Church by divine and supreme authority, to which all Christians are bound by office to obey, and to give the obedience of their mind to his judgment, whether they place it or not."

"*This is whether the consent of bishops accedes, or does not accede. Therefore the judgment of the Roman Pontiff is the infallible rule of faith, independently of the consent of the Church.*"

§ VI. The Conclusion is Proved by Reasons (Probatura Conclusio rationibus).

1°. I argue with our Hyacinthus Serry. That judgment in the matter of faith which is supreme is irreformable and ultimate, to which nothing superior is given to which appeal can be made. But such is the judgment of the Roman Pontiff speaking ex cathedra in matters of faith and morals. Therefore the major premise is clear.

Proof of the minor: 1°. From three Pontiffs, Boniface I, Gelasius I, and Nicholas I, in their Epistles to the Emperor Michael…

"*It is clear that the authority of the Apostolic See, whose authority is greater than all, no judgment is to be retracted by anyone; nor is it lawful for anyone to judge its judgment. Just as Boniface the Pope writes to Rufus and the other bishops constituted throughout Thessaly: "No one ever dared to lay hands on the Apostolic summit, from whose judgment it is not lawful to retract; no one in this rebellion dared to judge himself.*"

And blessed Pope Gelasius: "*These are the canons which allow appeals from the whole Church to be deferred to the examination of this See; but from this See itself, no one ever wanted to be deferred.*"

Proof 2°. The same minor, from Saint Augustine who, as we saw, held the judgment of Innocent I against the Pelagians as final and irreformable, when he said: "*The letters came from Rome; the cause is finished.*" This is also clear from many other Fathers whom we have praised earlier.

Proof 3°. The same minor premise.

1°. An appellant in a cause of appeal is exempted from the jurisdiction of him to whom he appeals, and recedes from his obedience. But no faithful person can be exempted from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Pontiff — otherwise he would no longer be his sheep, consequently not faithful; nor can he recede from his obedience, since he is the supreme Rector, Pastor, and Superior of all.

2°. A judge to whom appeal is made ought not to give or designate a judge to the appellant — otherwise he would act against himself. But such is only the Roman Pontiff — to indicate, convoke, confirm, and give strength to ecumenical councils. Therefore the judgment of the Roman Pontiff is the ultimate in the Church, consequently infallible and irreformable. The consequence is clear. Because if there were a tribunal to which appeal could be made from the

Pope, there would undoubtedly be a general council. Another reason for the conclusion: In the Church well ordered by Christ there ought to be admitted a judge who is always living and perpetual, who interprets the Scriptures, Traditions, and controversies of faith and morals indisputably and determines them. But such is no one except the Roman Pontiff.

Proof of the minor: This judge, supreme and infallible, is always living — he is not some private spirit, not secular princes (as we said earlier), not a general council; because although a Pontiff presiding, the rule of infallible faith is placed, yet it is not sufficient, because very rarely and with the greatest difficulty are general councils convoked, and yet continuously in the Church arise controversies of faith and morals, which must be determined by a judge always present.

They say there is present the universal Church, by whose consent the judgment of the supreme Pontiff becomes irreformable and infallible: Thus the fourth proposition of the declaration of the thirty-four Gallican bishops, of which above. And this seems to be the epoch of the present Gallican opinion, which, although refuted by what has been said up to this point, it helps nevertheless from these absurdities which follow from it, specially to impugn it: Whence it follows.

§ VII. | The Conclusion is Proved from the Absurdities of the Adverse Opinion.

If the judgment of the supreme Pontiff is not infallible in questions of faith and morals unless from the consent of the Church, it follows that:

(*Fr. Billuart highlights the following absurdities*)

1°. That the Pontiff borrows his infallibility from the Church, and thus that the Church is not founded in Peter, but Peter in the Church; that Peter does not feed the sheep, but the sheep feed Peter; that Peter does not confirm the brethren in faith, but the brethren confirm Peter; which are openly contrary to the Scriptures.

2°. That the supreme Pontiff does not enjoy the privilege of infallibility any more than a bishop of the smallest diocese; for this one defines something about faith and proposes to his dioceses what is to be believed, if the consent of the other bishops accedes, his judgment will be infallible — the same can be said of the judgment of a simple pastor or doctor. But the consequence is absurd and altogether alien from the Scriptures and the whole Tradition.

3°. That the faithful would be fluctuating in faith, nor have anything fixed and firm to which they could adhere with faith nor have anything fixed and firm to which they could adhere with faith. For what kind of Church consent is required? Of the whole Church, or of the greater part, or of the lesser, say of one province or nation? Not this last; for by what right would one province or

nation's Church confer on the Pontiff infallibility which it does not have? Not the first; otherwise it would suffice for the consent of one or another bishop or faithful to confirm the judgment.

4°. That the faithful would be fluctuating in faith, nor have anything fixed and firm to which they could adhere with faith. For what kind of Church consent is required? Of the whole Church, or of the greater part, or of the lesser, say of one province or nation? Not this last; for by what right would one province or nation's Church confer on the Pontiff infallibility which it does not have? Not the first; otherwise it would suffice for the consent of one or another bishop or faithful to confirm the judgment of the supreme Pontiff, and thus there would never be an infallible judgment. Moreover, how and when could the consent of bishops and faithful be obtained who are in the East Indies and West Indies? And in the meantime the faithful would fluctuate and heresies would grow strong. Not finally according to this: 1°. As I said just now about the third; whence the part of the Church, even the greater and not the whole Church, has infallibility which it attributes to the Pontiff? 2°. Who would count the consenting parts, so that it might be known whether the greater part adheres? Who would announce this consent to the faithful? Who would proclaim it from the beginning? From the beginning of the Church we know it was done once on the occasion of the Bull *Unigenitus*, to which nevertheless not all obey. What then of the innumerable ones of which it is not done? What of the future ones of which it is not credible that it would ever be done? In the meantime no faithful person would be bound to give assent of faith to the Decrees of the Pontiffs; no one is bound, nor can he assent to faith unless to an authority which he certainly knows to be infallible; because faith cannot subject itself to what is false; and

thus every one by his own judgment could dismiss it, and in the way I said, heresies would grow strong and gain strength.

3°. If the consent of the greater part suffices, it is not why the Gallicans dispute with such zeal; for among them, excepted, all other Churches, at least three parts of the whole University, acknowledge the supreme Pontiff infallible, no decree ex cathedra from him is rejected by the greater part of the Church. But, they say, it ought to be accepted by previous examination, D. By previous examination so that it may be understood what it contains, C. So that as a doubtful or erroneous thing it may be reformed, N. Otherwise it could happen that three parts of the Church with the Pontiff err in faith, and only Gaul with the supreme Pontiff preserve true faith; moreover whence could the faithful certainly know all bishops by previous examination to have accepted it? All bishops by previous examination accepted it? By what means would they ever know this examination, fluctuating, not bound to give assent of faith, nor could they: Where then would be the faith of the Church? Where is the Church?

§ VIII. | The Common and Principal Evasion of the Adversaries is Precluded.

Whatever we have brought forward up to this point from Scripture, Fathers, Councils, Pontiffs, Theologians, etc., for the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, the adversaries accept these things said, not about the man sitting in the chair of Peter, but about the chair itself, about the Roman See, about the Roman Church, and — as some say — about the series and succession of the Roman Pontiffs; so that the sense is that the chair of Peter, the Roman See, the Roman Church is infallible and never defectible in faith; and that if it should happen that one Pontiff defects, it is

emended by the successors, and thus faith will always remain in the Roman See, in the chair of Peter, in the Church, in the Roman Church. And to this end they praise that celebrated saying of St. Leo in Epistle 53 to Anatolius: "*There are two sees, some sit, others sit*," and because otherwise, they say, with the death of the Pontiff, it would defect, or perish.

Besides those things by which we have already refuted this interpretation from here and there, besides that we have brought forward many testimonies which prove infallibility not only of the See or the chair of Peter, or the Roman Church, but of the one sitting and of the Pontiff himself, even whenever his name is expressly mentioned; besides these, I say.

I ask now only what is understood by the See and the chair of Peter, or the Roman Church? Is it that which is contained within the circuit of the city of Rome? Or the universal or Catholic Church? For we see some understand the Church of the city of Rome, others the universal Church. Indeed in the same way to understand the Church of the city of Rome, sometimes universal, according to what is pressed by arguments.

If they understand the Church which is contained within the circuit of the city of Rome: The Supreme Pontiff defines something of faith ex cathedra, he has the Church of the city of Rome consenting; then because he consulted it in its principal members; then because it itself immediately assents to what is defined by the Pontiff; and thus the Pontiff defining ex cathedra is always infallible.

If they understand the Catholic and universal Church, they openly contradict the Scriptures in the three passages first proved, in which we proved the dignity of the foundation of the Church, of

the Pastor of the Church, of the confirmer of the brethren, whence follows infallibility given to Peter alone, and not to the whole Church. They also contradict Tradition, and all past antiquity, the Decrees of the Councils, and the Fathers, Pontiffs, Theologians, and even themselves. For the holy Fathers, Councils, Pontiffs, Theologians whom we have praised, and even the adversaries themselves, say that the Roman Church, which the proud gates of hell do not overcome, to which perfidy cannot have access, which finally is acknowledged to be infallible, is Mother and Teacher of all Churches, center of ecclesiastical unity, whence priestly unity arose, to which all Churches must necessarily convene, the Church is founded in it, and many similar things: but openly these things cannot be said of the universal Church, since besides it there are no other Churches. For what is there besides the universal Church except Churches? And indeed the universal Church is that which all Churches taken together comprise. But the whole is not distinguished from the parts taken together: Therefore it cannot be said of the universal Church that it is Mother and Teacher of all Churches, as it cannot be said that someone is pastor and teacher of himself, nor that it is the center of unity, as all lines cannot be the center of each line, nor that priestly unity arises from it, since it itself is priestly unity, nor that all other Churches must necessarily convene to it, since besides it, as has been said, there are no others, nor that the Church is founded in it, otherwise it would be founded in itself. Finally, let it be noted, to my studious Reader, attending to the testimonies which we have brought forward, will scarcely find even one in which that exotic interpretation is not refuted.

As for that saying of St. Leo: Undoubtedly "*there are two sees, some sit, others sit*": "See" is the name of authority, dignity, and office; "sitting" is the name of the person who obtains

authority, dignity, and office; and this signifies one who has authority and office, not always acting ex officio from authority and office; and thus the Roman Pontiff can not act ex officio Pontifical, but conduct himself as a private person — which helps the adversaries not at all, nor harms us.

As for what they add about the dead Pontiff: Let Canon 1, 4 of the Theological Loci, chapter last, respond, which says: "*...with the death of the supreme Pontiff, the Church remains and remains in it the Spirit of truth; but it is left maimed and diminished, without Christ's Vicar and the Church's one Pastor.*" Around this it is permitted that truth then is also in the Church (not only in the deceased Pontiff passively), but if controversies of faith and religion arise, the Church's judgments without a head on earth are not certain enough.

They insist: If by "Peter" and "foundation" is understood the physical and entitative person of Peter, it follows etc. If it is understood morally as the dignity, authority, jurisdiction, and doctrine of Peter himself, it follows etc. The consequence and its proof: These things, with Peter dying, persevere in the Church by virtue and pass to his successors: Just as with the death of a king, the kingdom does not perish, because the dignity, authority, jurisdiction, which pass to the successors: Just as with the death of a king, the kingdom does not perish, because the dignity, authority remains and passes to the successor.[4]

---

[4] St Iranaeus – Against Heresies Book 1, Chapter 2; Chapter 3.
St. Hippolytus the Martyr — Oration on the consummation of the world

- St. Basil — Epistle 74
- St. Flavian — Epistle to St. Leo
- St. Cyprian — On the Unity of the Church Book 1; Epistle 55
- St. Ambrose — Commentary on Psalm 40 ("Where Peter is, there is the Church")
- St. Jerome — Epistle 57 (to Pope Damasus): "Whoever does not gather with you scatters"; also his edition of the creed/symbol to Damasus
- St. Augustine — Sermon 2 (now 131) on the Apostle (post-Pelagian condemnation by Innocent I); Psalm commentary against Donatists ("You are the rock…")

- St. Leo I — Sermon 3 (on Luke 22); Epistle 89; Epistle 53 to Anatolius
- St. Agatho — Epistle to Emperor Constantine (read and approved at Sixth Synod/Constantinople III)
- Dionysius of Alexandria — (mentioned via Athanasius on appeals to Rome)
- Athanasius — (via references to synods and appeals)

Council of Nicaea (Canon 6)

- Council of Sardica (347 AD) — Canons 3, 4, 5, 7 (appeals to Rome)
- Council of Ephesus (431 AD)
- Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) — Acts 2 (Leo's Tome; "Peter has spoken through Leo")
- Council of Arles (455/475 AD) — Synodal letter to Leo
- Council of Tours (567 AD)
- Sixth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople III, 680–681 AD)
- Council of Melun (1579, Gallican Estates against Luther/Calvin)
- Estates of the Gallican Clergy (1626, article 1637; 1655 petition to Innocent X on Jansenius)

Pope Boniface I — Epistle to Rufus (Thessaly bishops); Epistle 8 to Emperor Michael

- Pope Gelasius I — Canons on appeals
- Pope Leo I (the Great) — Epistle to Flavian (Tome); Epistle 53 to Anatolius
- Pope Hormisdas — Epistle from St. Avitus
- Pope Nicholas I — Epistle to Emperor Michael
- Pope Innocent X (Jansenius condemnation, 1653/1658 Gallican thanks)

St. Thomas Aquinas — Summa Theologiae II-II q. 1 a. 10 (creed/symbol authority); q. 11 a. 2 ad 3; q. 10 de potestate a. 4 ad 13

- Gerson (Jean Gerson) — De Statibus Ecclesiasticis (consideration 3)
- Sylvio — Book 4, Controversies, article 5
- Soto
- Bellarmine
- D. Ant. (likely Antonius de Dominis or a scholastic commentator)
- Hyacinthus Serry (cited in rational argument)
- Natalis Alexander — Section 1, Dissertation 4
- Gersonius De Statibus Ecclesiasticis consid. 3

Declaration of the Gallican Clergy (1682) — Fourth Article

- Gallican Nation (1305 libel to Clement V against Boniface VIII)
- Paris Academy/University (tract to Clement VII on infallibility; decree 1324 on Thomas Aquinas canonization)
- Gallican Clergy Estates of Melun (1579)
- Gallican Estates (1626, article 1637; 1655 petition to Innocent X)
- St. Avitus of Vienne (517 Epistle to Hormisdas)
- Council of Arles (455/475 synodal letter to Leo)
- Council of Tours (567)

Decretals (Gratian/Extravagantes) — e.g., extra de Baptismo c. Maiores; 24 q. 1; Canon 1.4 de locis Theologicis

- Bull Unigenitus (Clement XI, 1713 — cited as example of papal definition)
- Book of Jansenius (condemned by Innocent X, 1653/1658 Gallicans)